Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) of the Arts and Sciences

Tenure Review Guidelines - July 1, 2016

Introduction and Overview

A candidate for tenure in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences undergoes a rigorous review process, first by the tenured faculty of the nominating department(s), or in the case of School of the Arts, the nominating division and school.

Then, the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences depends on a standing committee to conduct an Arts and Sciences level evaluation. The purpose of this review is to assess whether the department or school level review was rigorous and substantive and to ensure that all Arts and Sciences candidates meet the same high standards. In this way, a faculty of the highest quality and distinction will be maintained. The standing committee – the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) – serves in an advisory capacity to the Executive Vice President who determines whether or not the candidate should be recommended to the Provost for tenure.

If successful, the nomination is then reviewed by a University-wide standing committee (Tenure Review Advisory Committee, or TRAC). Subsequent approval is then required of the Provost, President and the Board of Trustees.

Part I of this document provides an overview of the policies and procedures for conducting tenure reviews at the Arts & Sciences level. It describes how the PTC is constituted, the work of the PTC, and the manner in which the meetings are conducted. Part II and the appendices provide guidelines and worksheets for schools and departments to follow in preparing materials for referee solicitation letters and preparing the candidate's dossier for the PTC (and TRAC) reviews. It also includes contacts and a timeline for submitting materials to the Office of the Executive Vice President for Arts & Sciences.

Part I

Criteria for an Appointment to Tenure

The criteria for an appointment to tenure are set forth in the Provost's (TRAC) guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews" which are available at http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Columbia_University_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf (pp. 3-4).

Nomination to Tenure

Every nomination to tenure requires a positive vote by the tenured faculty in the relevant department and, in the case of the School of the Arts, a positive vote by the tenured faculty and the endorsement of the dean. At a minimum, a majority of the eligible tenured faculty in a department or school must vote in favor of forwarding it for review by the PTC. The decision on whether to nominate must be made by an open vote or by signed ballots, or a mechanism must be in place that permits any faculty who vote no or abstain to be identified and asked to provide the PTC with an explanation of the reasons for their opposition or abstention. Joint appointments require positive votes from all of the nominating departments and schools.

Selection of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The PTC consists of twelve full professors in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, representing the three divisions, who typically serve for three year terms. The PTC members, and its chair, are appointed by the Executive Vice President in consultation with the Planning and Policy Committee (PPC).

Selection of the Review Panel for Each Tenure Review

For each tenure review, a seven person review panel is constituted by the Executive Vice President in consultation with the chair of the PTC. The review panel consists of a reading subpanel of two tenured Columbia faculty members not on the PTC (the external, or outside, members) and two PTC members who are familiar with the candidate's field of specialization and will be charged with performing a critical reading of the candidate’s scholarly work. One of the members of the subpanel will be asked to be chair of the subpanel. The remainder of the review panel consists of two additional PTC members, one of whom is close in discipline to the candidate and another of whom is distant from the candidate’s field, and the chair of the PTC. This representation is intended to ensure an appropriate depth and breadth of knowledge while also ensuring that the standards for tenure are consistent across the disciplines.

Members of the review panel may not have collaborated with the candidate, served on a search committee that selected the nominee, or voted on the nomination at either the department or school level. The outside members may hold tenured appointments in any faculty in the University. Retired members of the tenured faculty may also serve as outside members when the chair of the PTC and the Executive Vice President conclude that they can bring a needed expertise to the evaluation of a candidate. The Executive Vice President may change the membership of the review panel at any time after consulting with the chair of the review panel and the chair of the PTC. Membership on review panels is confidential.

Evidence Considered by the PTC

The evidence considered by the PTC includes supporting statements – a case statement prepared by the department, a teaching and research statement prepared by the candidate, and in some departments, the report of an internal review panel – along with the candidate's cv, solicited external referee letters, the candidate's representative publications, syllabi, and teaching evaluations, and the testimony of witnesses. These materials are described in detail in the Provost's (TRAC) guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews" which are available at http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Columbia_University_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf (pp. 5-9 and 18-27).

Deadlines for Submitting Materials to the PTC

To assist the Office of the Executive Vice President in planning the work of the PTC, the chair or dean should submit referee solicitation materials (cv, teaching/research statement, names of referees, consultants, comparison scholars, selected publications, etc., described in Part II) for all individuals whom they expect to review for tenure no later than March 1 of the academic year preceding the expected review. In the case of some nominations, the candidate will not have been identified by the beginning of March. External searches may not be completed by then or it may become necessary to prepare a tenure review for a junior faculty member who is being recruited by another university. As additional candidates are identified, the chair or dean should notify the Office of the Executive Vice President.

The dossier (case statement and supporting materials, described in Part II) for internal candidates (meeting their up-out date in the year following the review) must be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President by the beginning of December*. The nominations and complete dossiers for other internal and all external candidates should be submitted as soon as is feasible and no later than mid-January*. The Executive Vice President will grant exceptions to that deadline only to meet a competing offer from another university, or where there are other special circumstances that make a late nomination unavoidable.

A dossier is not considered complete until all of the materials have been submitted. The original dossier may be augmented with new materials at any point prior to the meeting of the PTC. It is especially important for the chair or dean to ensure that the PTC has a current curriculum vitae and statement from the nominee at the time of its meeting.

*Please note that the review subpanel of the PTC is usually given four weeks to review the materials; therefore the complete dossier should be delivered to Academic Affairs five weeks before the review date for vetting and distribution to the subpanel.

Role of the Divisional Deans

The divisional deans normally participate in reviews ***within their divisions*** at the following stages in the process:

1) give authorization to the department to conduct the review;

2) give authorization to the department to advance to the letter writing stage;

3) vet the lists of referees and comparables with consultants, if they are deemed necessary;

4) review the referee letters;

5) vet external members for subpanels;

6) vet the draft of the case statement and other materials as needed;

7) provide input to the Chair of the PTC on the witnesses to appear before the PTC;

8) provide other input to the Executive Vice President and the Chair of the PTC as needed;

9) attend the PTC review meetings, and where necessary, advise on procedural questions;

10) issue a written opinion as to whether the Executive Vice President should recommend the candidate for tenure. This written opinion becomes part of the dossier delivered to TRAC.

Scheduling of the Meetings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVP) schedules regular standing meetings of the PTC in advance of the academic year. The PTC meets weekly from late September through early May. The PTC chair and the Executive Vice President will establish the committee's calendar of reviews and set agendas for each meeting.

While scheduling, the AVP makes every effort to find a time that is convenient for everyone who may participate in the review to attend, but it is not always possible to avoid conflicts with other responsibilities. Since tenure is of the highest importance to the University, it may be necessary to ask participants to reschedule other commitments so that they are available to attend a committee meeting. PTC meetings take precedence over all other committee assignments and all administrative duties within the University. In some cases, it may also be necessary to ask participants to rearrange meetings with students and classes in order to provide sufficient time for the committee's deliberations.

While every effort is made to accommodate the witnesses, it may be necessary to ask the dean or the chair of the nominating unit for someone else to testify on behalf of the candidate, or to

proceed with the committee meeting without an individual who cannot attend. If the dean or the chair considers both of these alternatives detrimental to the nominee's case, he or she may ask the Executive Vice President to delay the meeting to a time when the witness is available.

It is not always possible to arrange for all members of the review panel to attend the meeting in person. The Executive Vice President may, therefore, choose to have members participate by video- or tele-conferencing.

New PTC members are required to attend two PTC meetings as observers and, thereafter, all meetings of the tenure reviews to which they are assigned as review panel members for the maintenance and communication of uniform standards. No review may occur without the participation of all the review panel members assigned to it.

Tenure reviews and completion of tenure reviews will not be delayed due to the unavailability of administrators who have the right to attend as observers.

Tenure Review

It is the responsibility of each review panel, working under the guidance of the chair of the PTC, to conduct a thorough and independent review of the nomination under consideration. The review panel should not feel pressured by external circumstances to come to a hasty judgment. At the same time, fairness to the candidate and the deadline for forwarding the case to the Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC) require that the review panel complete its review and reach its decision as soon as it responsibly can.

The work of the review panel begins with the careful review of the nominee's dossier and the careful reading of the candidate's scholarly work by the reading subpanel. While referee evaluations provide the committee with the views of leading scholars in the nominee's field, these cannot substitute for the subpanel's reasoned assessment of the quality of the nominee's scholarship.

The chairs of the PTC and the subpanel are responsible for ensuring that the dossier is sufficient to meet the review panel's needs. The chair of the subpanel is expected to consult with the rest of the subpanel in advance of the meeting to determine whether further information is needed and to alert each member to any concerns that other members might have about the nomination.

After evaluating the documentation presented by the nominating department or school, the review panel may make any further inquiries it feels are necessary to ensure that it has sufficient information about the proposed appointment. For example, the review panel has the right to request that the Executive Vice President solicit additional referee evaluations or to ask

for further written statements from the nominating unit. It may also ask for additional witnesses, even from outside the University, if it is not satisfied that those suggested by the department or school will enable it to make an informed judgment about the nomination.

The subpanel may meet in advance of the meeting to discuss and prepare the case for presentation to the review panel, but will only vote at the same time as the review panel at the conclusion of the full deliberations. The reading subpanel is responsible for reading both the dossier and the set of representative written work. The remaining members of the review panel are responsible for reading the dossier for each candidate, but not the set of representative written work.

The PTC chair conducts the meetings of the review panel. If the chair of the PTC is serving on the subpanel assigned to read the candidate's work or is unable to attend a meeting, the Executive Vice President in consultation with the chair of the PTC will select an acting chair of the PTC for that review. The Executive Vice President or a representative attends all PTC meetings and may actively participate in the questioning of witnesses and in the discussion of the committee.

The Executive Vice President calls upon persons to appear before the PTC who can present information on the need for the tenured appointment and on the nominee's qualifications. These witnesses are selected in consultation with the chair of the PTC and the chair of the nominating unit. The appropriate department chair or dean presents the case for the nomination and is usually the principal witness. He or she may delegate this responsibility to another tenured faculty member who can more effectively discuss the nominee's qualifications and proposed role in the department or school. A second witness, typically from the nominating department or school will be asked to testify to the quality of the candidate's scholarship and teaching. When the candidate will have appointments in more than one department or school, the chairs or deans of all of the relevant units are routinely invited to appear before the committee. The chair or dean of the nominating unit is informed of all witnesses who will appear before the PTC.

The chair of the subpanel leads the discussion about the nominee's qualifications. If the review panel decides that additional information, testimony, or deliberation is required, the review is resumed at a subsequent meeting or meetings until the deliberations are complete. Once the review panel has concluded its deliberations its seven members, the five PTC members and the two outside members, vote on the nomination by open vote. The chair of the subpanel conveys the recommendation to the EVPAS in an informative and candid report which provides the vote and the reasons for the vote and summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of the case, including any reservations or concerns that arose during the discussion and how they were

addressed. Any abstentions or "no" votes will require a statement from the PTC member, and will be attached to the recommendation.

The PTC serves in an advisory capacity to the Executive Vice President who is not bound by the recommendation. In particular, a split vote in favor of a candidate is not a strong recommendation. In addition to the final vote, the Executive Vice President weighs the evidence presented to the committee and the discussion of the members at their meeting before deciding whether or not to accept their recommendation. The Executive Vice President may also obtain additional information after the meeting before reaching a decision on the nomination, such as written assessments of the nominee from the members of the PTC or further written or verbal evaluations from experts at other institutions.

Upon completion of his or her review, the Executive Vice President submits a recommendation to the Provost, along with the dossier, for consideration by the Provost's Standing Committee on Tenure – the Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC). When forwarding a candidate to the Provost for the next level of review, the Executive Vice President will provide the Provost with a written account of the PTC's vote and the reasons for the decision. The Executive Vice President will convey the outcome of each case to the department chair who may inform the candidate whether the case has been forwarded to the Provost for the next level of review.

Confidentiality

While the membership of the PTC is public information, all aspects of its proceedings are conducted with strict confidentiality. Committee members, witnesses, and any others who are involved with the tenure review process in any way are expected to maintain confidentiality at all times. Because of the need for confidentiality, the membership of the review panel and its meeting date are made known only to individuals who participate in its constitution or deliberations. The content of the discussion about a nomination and the actual vote are similarly restricted to the members of the review panel and to the Executive Vice President or his representatives. Anyone involved in a review who wishes to discuss the proceedings should do so by communicating not to a member of the PTC but with the Chair of the PTC.

Part II

Preparing a Nomination to Tenure for the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC)

This section is intended to assist departments and schools in preparing their tenure nominations in a thorough and timely manner, so as to avoid the delays that will result from

incomplete documentation or late submission. It contains guidelines on the required materials that should be submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President and, in the appendices, provides a timeline for their submission.

Preliminary Preparations

Internal Promotions to Tenure

For internal promotions to tenure, the tenure review process begins, when in the first week of September, the Office of Academic Affairs in the Arts and Sciences sends to each department chair and director of academic administration and finance (DAAF) the Departmental Service Records that provide the review schedules of each non-tenured faculty member, and a list of those faculty who must be considered for tenure in the subsequent year. These include associate professors in their 6th counted year of service, who were hired as assistant professors, and associate professors, hired as such, in their second or third year of counted service.

At the department's discretion, candidates are invited to submit dossier materials to the department any time before February 1st. This includes an updated curriculum vitae, a representative set of written work, published and unpublished, and a brief statement of no more than 5-10 pages that discusses his or her current research and teaching, and plans for future projects. By the beginning of March, the department decides whether to proceed to the letter-writing stage and notifies the Office of Academic Affairs of its decision.

External Hires to Tenure

For external hires to tenure, the tenure review process begins when the department has completed the recruitment process. Every effort should be made to identify external candidates as early as possible in the academic year. The University, along with most other major universities, endorses the AAUP policy guideline that sets May 15th as the last date on which an offer can be made to a faculty member at another institution for appointment the following fall. The offer cannot be contingent upon a favorable outcome of a tenure review. To meet the AAUP deadline, chairs and deans should send the Office of the Executive Vice President the dossiers for their external candidates by January 15.

Recognizing that negotiations with faculty at other universities can be protracted and delicate, the PTC will attempt to conduct evaluations of external candidates nominated after that date. However, if the review cannot be conducted by TRAC by May 15th, the Executive Vice President will have to obtain a waiver of the AAUP's deadline from the candidate's institution before it can occur.

Solicitation of Referee Letters

Once the department has decided to forward the candidate to the letter-writing stage, the department submits preliminary review materials to the Office of Academic Affairs by March 1 in the case of internal candidates for promotion to tenure and as soon as is feasible in the case of external candidates.

Please see **A&S TENURE REVIEW List Prep Worksheet** for a full list of the necessary materials.

Written evaluations of the proposed appointment by recognized authorities form a critical source of information for the PTC. Evaluations of candidates are solicited by the Executive Vice President.

The Divisional Dean determines the scholars who will be asked for referee letters and serve as the comparison scholars, taking into consideration suggestions received from the nominating department or school, and recommendations made by consultants.

For each nominee, several scholars at other institutions who are familiar with the candidate's field of specialization are selected as **consultants** so that the Divisional Dean on behalf of the EVPAS may consult them at any point in the review process if he or she chooses to do so. For example, the consultant may be asked for input on the proposed referee and comparison lists or the candidate's curriculum vitae. These consultants are recommended by the department and may not include anyone who has participated in the candidate's doctoral or post-doctoral training or who has collaborated, worked or published with the candidate. To avoid the possibility of prior association, the Divisional Dean does not normally ask scholars who served as a colleague at another institution or overlapped with the candidate at an institution when the candidate was a doctoral student or post-doc. Consultants may not be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's tenure review.

While a dossier will typically contain 12-15 referee letters, the number of evaluations matters less than the scholars who provide them. **Referees** should consist primarily of the leading figures in the nominee's area of specialization, but may also be well-established scholars or professionals in related fields who can provide informed evaluations of his or her work. They may include scholars from institutions abroad as well as the United States, and collaborators or former mentors. They may not, however, be members of Columbia's faculty.

Each referee is asked to compare the candidate with other scholars in his or her field. In selecting the **comparison scholars**, care should be taken to define the field of specialization in which the appointment is being proposed in a manner which is appropriate, but not so narrow that the referees find it difficult to make meaningful comparisons between the nominee and other scholars. The comparison list always contains 5-6 leading figures in the nominee's

specialization, even when the nominee is a younger scholar. In those cases, the referees are asked to give their assessment of whether the nominee has the potential of reaching the level of achievement of the more senior comparison scholars.

Since the comparison scholars are chosen on the basis of their academic distinction, they may also be asked for evaluations of the nominee. The comparison list should include tenured scholars only. Exceptions should be made only in the unusual instance of exceptionally strong non-tenured faculty who are likely to be tenured at their home institutions in the immediate future. That said, there may be reasons why peers of the nominee should not be asked for evaluations. For example, a comparison scholar may hold a non-tenured appointment at another university or may have applied for the position for which the candidate is being considered.

To assist them in their task of evaluating the candidate, the referees are provided with the nominee's curriculum vitae, the nominee's research and teaching statement, and samples of the nominee's written work, and names of the comparison scholars.

Once the lists have been vetted by the Divisional Dean, the Executive Assistant to the Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences prepares to solicit the referee letters. Before sending the letters, the chair is asked to review the draft of the referee letter, with particular reference to the deadline for the receipt of letters. Normally, the deadline given is six weeks from the date of the solicitation. In some cases, however, it is possible to set a deadline one month from that date or, if necessary, to allow a longer period before the due date. In these cases, the chair is always consulted. At this time, the Assistant Vice President also asks the chair or DAAF to confirm that the hard-copy of any publications are ready to send to the referees, upon request.

Once the letters are solicited, the referees respond to the Executive Assistant indicating their willingness to provide a letter or declining to write. These email responses are forwarded to the department as they are received, and are sent to the chair and DAAF, and/or any additional chair designee. For those who commit to write on behalf of the candidate, a secure website with the candidate's selected publications (articles, papers and unpublished manuscripts) will be made available to them. However, published books must be purchased by the department and sent to each referee who commits. In this case, the Executive Assistant forwards the email to a designated point person in the department who is responsible for sending any books (and, if requested, the entire publication set) to the referees who commit to writing.

The Executive Assistant sends follow-up letters after an appropriate period of time to those referees who have not responded to the initial request. The timing and form of these reminders is determined by the urgency of the tenure review. The Executive Assistant thanks each referee and forwards the tally sheet, and the letters as they arrive, to the department.

Department or School Review, Deliberation and Vote

When the full set of referee letters is received, the department conducts the review according to its procedures. The tenured members of the department discuss the case and vote on whether to recommend appointment to tenure.

Preparation of the Dossier for PTC Review

Once the department has voted, the chair, or chair designee among the tenured faculty, prepares the dossier. The dossier consists of the case statement and all supporting materials. This is the same dossier that will be submitted to TRAC in the case of a positive outcome at the PTC review.

The PTC begins its evaluation of a nomination with the information provided in the dossier. It is therefore in the interest of the nominating unit to present its case as clearly and coherently as possible, addressing all of the issues that the PTC is expected to consider. It is the responsibility of the chair or dean making the nomination to see that the materials required for the dossier are complete, accurate, and submitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President on schedule.

Please see **A&S TENURE REVIEW Dossier Prep Worksheet** for the full list of necessary materials.

The Case Statement

The nominating department or school prepares a case statement containing the following written components:

- Analysis of the Department or School and Its Objectives
- Report on the Selection Process.
- Report on the Departmental Tenure Vote
- Assessment of the Nominee's Qualifications
  a) Research and scholarship
  b) Teaching qualifications
  c) Service

For a more detailed accounting of what should be in each section, please see the Provost's (TRAC) guidelines, "Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews" which are available at http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpaa/docs/Columbia_University_Tenure_Guidelines.pdf (pp. 20-23)

Submission of Case Statement and Dossier

Once the case statement is prepared, the chair or dean forwards the case statement electronically to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and the relevant Divisional Dean, who vets the document.

Once the Associate Vice President or Divisional Dean indicates that the case statement has been vetted, all dossier materials should be placed on the X: drive to be shared with the Office of the Executive Vice President, with the exception of published books which must be submitted hard-bound or paperback in 210 Low Library.

Preparations for PTC Review

The Assistant Vice President prepares the full dossier according to the specifications in the Provost's Guidelines, and once the dossier is deemed complete, distributes it to the review panel on a secure website in Courseworks or hard-copy, as requested.

Preparations for TRAC Review

Upon completion of the PTC review and his or her own review, the Executive Vice President submits a recommendation to the Provost which includes a written account of the discussion and vote (the PTC panel chair report) and the candidate's dossier, and conveys the outcome of each case to the department chair, who may then inform the candidate.

Appendices

- Steps in a Successful Tenure Review - Timeline
- List Preparation Worksheet
- Dossier Preparation Worksheet

Steps in a Successful Tenure Review - Initiated in 2016-17 for Tenure Review to Occur in 2017-18

Step	Time Frame	Action	Contact Person(s)
1	By mid-September, 2016	The Office of Academic Affairs sends list of faculty who must be reviewed in 2016-17 for consideration for tenure in 2017-18 as part of the Service Record email to department chair and DAAF.	Michael Susi, Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs
2	Fall 2016	Department invites candidate to prepare materials and names review committee. Written invitation asks candidate to gather: 1) An updated curriculum vitae 2) A representative set of written work, published and unpublished 3) A brief statement of 5-10 pages that discusses his or her current research and teaching and plans for future projects.	Department Chair
3	By February 1, 2017	Candidate submits materials to department.	Department Chair
4	By end of February, 2017	On the basis of the review, department determines whether to proceed to the letter writing stage. Department chair notifies Office of Academic Affairs of its decision.	Department Chair & Michael Susi
5	By March 1, 2017	Department chair submits to Office of Academic Affairs, for approval by divisional dean, materials for solicitation of referee letters as described in the **A&S TENURE REVIEW List Prep Worksheet.**	Department Chair & Michael Susi
6	By mid-March, 2017	Divisional Dean vets the lists of referees and comparables, with the help of consultants. Works with Department Chair to finalize these lists. Department orders candidate's books, for mailing to referees upon notification of referee's commitment to write.	Divisional Dean Department Chair Department Chair's designee.
7	By April 1, 2017	EVPAS solicits letters via email from referees. Executive Assistant checks with chair to review the letter draft and approve the deadline before sending.	Ruby Cruz, Executive Assistant to EVPAS & Department Chair
8	From April to end of August, 2017	Executive Assistant forwards referee letters as they arrive to the chair and DAAF. Chair designee mails/emails books to those referees who request them. Executive Assistant sends follow-up emails after an appropriate period of time to those referees who have not responded to the initial request.	Ruby Cruz Department Chair and designee
9	September 2017	The department conducts a review according to its procedures. Chair forwards the materials used by the department in its deliberations to the chair of the parallel Barnard department. The letter of transmittal should request a written letter of assessment from the Barnard department, including a record of the vote taken. The chair of the Barnard department prepares a statement of its assessment of the candidate's qualifications that transmits the vote of the department.	Department Chair Barnard Department Chair
10	September to mid-November, 2017	Department chair prepares the case statement according to the specifications in the Principles and Customs Governing University-Wide Tenure Reviews. Department chair forwards the department vote and case statement, in a WORD document via email, to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.	Department Chair Margaret Edsall, Associate Vice President

11	October to mid-November, 2017	Once the Associate Vice President indicates that the case statement has been vetted by the divisional dean, the supporting materials should be submitted electronically to Assistant Vice President (with the exception of published books which should be submitted at the same time but in hard copy.) Each item should be sent in a separate, paginated pdf or WORD document. **Please see A&S TENURE REVIEW Dossier Prep Worksheet**	Michael Susi Department Chair and designee
12	October 2017 to April 2018	Promotion and Tenure Committee Review – Dossier distributed; PTC review scheduled; Once the PTC has reviewed the candidate, the Executive Vice President provides the Provost with a written account of the vote, and Executive Vice President conveys outcome to department chair who informs the candidate.	Michael Susi EVPAS Department Chair
13	October 2017 to April 2018	AVP of Academic Affairs forwards recommendation for tenure with complete dossier and PTC subpanel recommendation to Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs.	Michael Susi Angel Flesher, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs
14		Once dossier is deemed ready to distribute, the case is forwarded to the Tenure Review Advisory Committee (TRAC) for consideration.	Christopher Brown, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs Angel Flesher
15		TRAC Review	Christopher Brown
16		Provost confers with President on candidate's tenurability.	John Coatsworth, Provost
17		Provost notifies Executive Vice President.	John Coatsworth
18		Department chair notifies candidate.	Department Chair
19		Trustees authorize tenure of candidate; communication to department chair and DAAF from Academic Affairs.	Michael Susi